

HEALTH ENGINEERING AND SOCIETY SERIES

HEALTH INFORMATION SET



Volume 5

Information Practices and Knowledge in Health

**Edited by
Céline Paganelli
Viviane Clavier**

ISTE

WILEY

Table of Contents

[Cover](#)

[Title Page](#)

[Copyright](#)

[Introduction](#)

[1 Open Access as a Regulation of Scientific Information in Health](#)

[1.1. Introduction](#)

[1.2. The political anchoring of Open Access in the field of Health](#)

[1.3. Gold Open Access or the “Author-Pays” principle](#)

[1.4. Predatory journals: the “price” of change](#)

[1.5. The place and weight of funding agencies in the OA environment](#)

[1.6. Plan S, a “radicalization”¹² of Open Access in Health?](#)

[1.7. Scientific information in Health: a world of no journals?](#)

[1.8. Conclusion](#)

[1.9. References](#)

[2 Knowledge Organization and Studies of Information Practices: Contribution to the Characterization of Health Information](#)

[2.1. Introduction](#)

[2.2. Theoretical framework](#)

[2.3. Discourse collection and corpus analysis: approaches to health information from the “field”](#)

[2.4. Conclusion: towards a characterization of health information](#)

[2.5. References](#)

[3 Health Literacy in Complex Digital Information Environments](#)

[3.1. Introduction](#)

[3.2. Analyzing health information on the Internet: the need for a mixed and comprehensive approach](#)

[3.3. Key findings and issues in digital health literacy](#)

[3.4. Health, information and digital technology: a logic in line with transliteracy](#)

[3.5. Conclusion](#)

[3.6. References](#)

[4 The Essential Role of Health Information Literacy in Seniors' Healthcare Communication](#)

[4.1. Introduction](#)

[4.2. Health information behavior of older adults](#)

[4.3. Literacies related to health](#)

[4.4. Literacies and older age](#)

[4.5. Health literacy and healthcare communication](#)

[4.6. Health information literacy and health information behavior](#)

[4.7. Measuring health information literacy](#)

[4.8. Communication between seniors and healthcare professionals](#)

[4.9. Health information literacy and healthcare communication](#)

[4.10. Conclusions](#)

[4.11. Appendix 1: standard regression results](#)

4.12. References

5 Categorization of Audiences and Hierarchization of Actors in the Journalistic Narrative on HIV/AIDS Prevention. What Implications for Prevention Information?

5.1. Introduction

5.2. Methodology

5.3. Routinized journalistic treatment of HIV/AIDS prevention

5.4. Categorizing users: between stigmatization and the need for prevention

5.5. From a categorization of the public based on membership in a risk group to a focus on practices

5.6. Media coverage of biomedical prevention actors

5.7. Conclusion

5.8. References

6 Historical Approach to Health Information in Anti-alcohol Prevention: The Case of the American National Prohibition Campaign (1910-1919)

6.1. Introduction

6.2. Health information in the prohibitionist campaign

6.3. Communicating health information

6.4. Information and influence

6.5. Conclusion

6.6. References

7 Professional Uses of Specialized Information in Ophthalmology. Interview with Pascal Four, Doctor of Ophthalmology

[7.1. Training and areas of intervention in ophthalmology](#)

[7.2. Information useful in the context of medical practice](#)

[7.3. Access to knowledge and information sources](#)

[7.4. Time spent searching for information, criteria for evaluating information](#)

[7.5. Information exchanged with patients](#)

[7.6. Knowledge organization and structuring of the document base](#)

[7.7. Appendix: interview grid](#)

[8 Organization of Medical Knowledge: Documentation Techniques Applied to a Macro-domain Underpinned by Socio-political Issues](#)

[8.1. Introduction](#)

[8.2. Documentation and Library and Information Sciences and the organization of knowledge](#)

[8.3. Methodology](#)

[8.4. Presentation of the corpus of publications between 1960 and 2019](#)

[8.5. Medical knowledge organization systems](#)

[8.6. New challenges for indexing and information retrieval](#)

[8.7. Social, cultural, political and economic issues](#)

[8.8. Discussion](#)

[8.9. Conclusion](#)

[8.10. References](#)

[8.11. Appendix 1: the corpus of journal articles and conference proceedings](#)

[8.12. Appendix 2: MKOS corpus](#)

[List of Authors](#)

[Index](#)

[End User License Agreement](#)

List of Illustrations

Chapter 6

[Figures 6.1 and 6.2. Pamphlet “Beer a food?” \(Safety First\) and Pamphlet 22 \(STF...](#)

[Figure 6.3. Modalities of evidence for health information](#)

[Figure 6.4. Distribution of visual representations by type](#)

[Figures 6.5 and 6.6. Pamphlet 9 \(STF\) and Pamphlet 2 \(STF\)](#)

[Figure 6.7. Thematic classification of pamphlets by effect](#)

List of Tables

Chapter 4

[Table 4.1. Socio-demographic background of the 281 respondents](#)

[Table 4.2. Responses to statements on communication in a healthcare context \(ada...](#)

Chapter 6

[Table 6.1. Summary table of health themes](#)

[Table 6.2. Identification of the Federation’s health information competencies](#)

[Table 6.3. The rhetoric of error](#)

Health Information Set

coordinated by
Céline Paganelli and Viviane Clavier

Volume 5

Information Practices and Knowledge in Health

Edited by

Céline Paganelli

Viviane Clavier

ISTE

WILEY

First published 2022 in Great Britain and the United States by ISTE Ltd and John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licenses issued by the CLA. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside these terms should be sent to the publishers at the undermentioned address:

ISTE Ltd
27-37 St George's Road
London SW19 4EU
UK

www.iste.co.uk

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
111 River Street
Hoboken, NJ 07030
USA

www.wiley.com

© ISTE Ltd 2022

The rights of Céline Paganelli and Viviane Clavier to be identified as the authors of this work have been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s), contributor(s) or editor(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of ISTE Group.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2021949036

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-78630-611-1

Introduction

This collective work, the fifth in the series *Health Information*, brings together eight contributions. It deals with health information and communication and highlights strong trends or “movements” in the field of health, which consist of many dimensions to be articulated in order to approach knowledge and information practices.

A first movement involves the growing visibility of health issues in the public space, an observation that dates back more than 20 years, as shown by issue 95 of the French journal *Réseaux* published in 1999 on “Science, the sick and the public space”. This issue focused on patients and patient organizations that had acquired legitimacy in the public arena, thus contributing “to a new way of thinking about the relationship between science and the general public”. This relationship, according to the authors [CAR 99, p. 10] “[was] less of an asymmetrical relationship of expertise and pedagogy, but rather [allowed for] the expression of scientific uncertainties, the sensitive involvement of caregivers or the claims of patients” [*ibid.*]. The media appear to be the key players in this publicizing of health issues. As early as the 1980s, television relayed appeals for donations or compassion for the Telethon [WAL 98]; the “media coverage” of AIDS or the story of contaminated blood provided the opportunity for “tests of strength” between the political, medical and judicial arenas, as well as for the internal tests of strength in the journalistic field on the “legitimate definition of information” [CHA 94]. Beyond the media space, society as a whole is, according to the health sociologist Pierre Aïach [AÏA 98] and the anthropologist, sociologist and doctor Didier Fassin [FAS 98], going through a process of

medicalization that they consider to be a cultural transformation. Protecting ourselves and fighting against illness, detecting and preventing risks, staying healthy, etc. have become a constant preoccupation, elevated to the rank of a movement: healthism [CRA 82]. This “concept”, which emerged during the 1970s and 1980s, refers in particular to the Foucauldian thesis according to which individuals come to adhere to social norms of their own free will, even though they are not forced to do so. According to H  l  ne Pouliquin, healthism is recognized as “an elevation of health to the rank of virtues and morality, accompanied by an individual duty to maintain health by making individuals responsible, even if at the same time the state disengages from acting on the social, political and economic determinants of health” [POU 15, p. 26]. Promotional discourse and consumer practices are part of this trend, as Benoit Lafon shows with another neologism he calls “sanitarization” to indicate, once again, a double movement perceptible in the “consumer press” [LAF 20]: on the one hand, the consideration of public health issues in entire sectors of the economy, which, beyond agriculture, concern various industrial activities such as agri-food, chemistry or electronics. On the other hand, the increasing consumerization of healthcare is manifested in the growth of medical devices, “reimbursed” by complementary health insurance organizations in competition with each other (glasses, hearing aids, etc.), or by the ever-expanding dynamics of the drug industry towards other areas to be medicalized (well-being, smoking, etc.). This same tendency can be found in food, as attested by a third neologism coined in 2009 by the food sociologist Jean-Pierre Poulain [POU 09]. Thus, the “nutritionalization” of food refers to the management of food in the context of a specific pathology by a health professional specialized in nutrition. It also refers to the massive diffusion of nutritional

knowledge in health education, prevention campaigns and the media.

A second movement is linked to the reconfiguration of public service in hospitals and health institutions, and to the evolution of forms of management that aim to reconcile a number of “complex and manifold challenges” [GRE 19]. The context is marked by cost reduction, rationalization of professional activities, inequalities in social and territorial access to healthcare, the aging of the population and the increase in chronic diseases. Nevertheless, the healthcare on offer must always be improved in order to ensure patient satisfaction. Thus, the development and modernization of information systems for public and private institutions is part of a policy to improve administrative, logistical and care processes [VIG 18]. Among these systems, the Electronic Patient Record (EPR), although not recently introduced, is emblematic of the evolution of hospital practice and is the result of both the need for traceability of actions and decisions associated with patient care and the need for coordination between specialists in charge of patients [MOR 18]. The deployment of EPRs in healthcare institutions has made it possible, thanks to surveys of health professionals, to specify expectations in terms of information (relevance, availability, reliability, security, real-time updating, etc.); integration of heterogeneous data or definition of knowledge meta-models to promote semantic interoperability between terminologies [CAB 17]. Thus, the organization of knowledge and the information practices of professionals are at the heart of reflections on the design or uses of these health information systems.

A third movement concerns patients taking responsibility for their own health. The notion of “health democracy”, which appeared in the political field and was used for the first time by the public authorities in the early 2000s,

covers citizen participation in health policies [ARV 16] and was officially included in the functioning of the French healthcare system by the law of March 4, 2002, relating to the rights of patients and the quality of the healthcare system [LET 09]. The role of users, sick or healthy, of their relatives or of patients' associations is thus recognized when it comes to health issues [LEF 18]. Combined with the development of liberal economic policies in the health sector, "health democracy" seems to have led to an increase in control regulations [DEM 14], the emergence of the patient-client, thus promoting a consumerist approach to health [BAT 08], or even the instrumentation of users, as denounced by certain associations [LEF 18]. Nevertheless, this evolution has been accompanied by the development of systems for accessing health information, allowing patients to consult information or share their experiences; associations to publish documentation on the Internet or to structure communities for exchange and sharing. Thus, the user takes control of health issues by discussing the issues with medical professionals, supporting a loved one, or dealing with a diagnosis or the evolution of an illness, in order to find practical information or verify scientific data. According to a 2016 IPSOS survey, more than 68% of French people have already consulted the Internet to find medical information, whether it be via collaborative sites, general sites dedicated to health or institutional sites [CAS 16]. The medical profession, friends and family, and the media are also sources of information that are sought after. A real knowledge base is then developed, "lay expertise" that emerges among patients. This expertise is based on lived experience and considers that people, through their personal experience of an illness, acquire specific knowledge on the issue. It is recognized by users of discussion forums or social health networks, who consult these systems to solicit testimonies from patients or former patients [PAG 11]. It also consists of real medical and

scientific expertise. Indeed, patients, often through associations that bring them together, invest in the scientific field, appropriating specialized knowledge in order to make their voices heard and participate in the governance of the healthcare system [AKR 12]. The development of this form of expertise is facilitated by access to specialized information resources via the Internet. Although the notion of the expert patient is now well established, it in fact conceals a very contrasting reality. First, because it reduces the patient's identity to their illness [GRI 20], and second because it does not take the diversity of situations into account. The availability of information resources and easy access to digital devices do not guarantee the appropriation of knowledge. Studies on health literacy, which the WHO defines as "the personal characteristics and social resources needed by individuals and communities to access, understand, evaluate and use information and services to make health decisions"¹, show the diversity of the necessary skills (informational, media-related, medical, etc.) and the constant need to update these skills [MAR 17]. The implementation of mediation actions or systems, relying in particular on documentary mediators [TET 20], therefore appears essential. Finally, using therapeutic education to improve health literacy would contribute to supporting patients in the appropriation of knowledge related to disease and, more generally, to reducing inequalities in access to care [MAR 17].

A fourth movement concerns the development of digital devices in the service of health, a sector that is experiencing various kinds of initiatives and constant growth. Estimated at 2.7 billion euros in 2014, the e-health market is dominated by innovative start-ups specializing in telemedicine². These include technologies that enhance health knowledge³, such as those that take medical

investigation further or reduce surgical risks, and that are used to rationalize and control the production of care. We should also mention other applications, such as medical imaging, training devices (for surgical procedures, for example) for learning, individual training and simulation, or even connected objects, which are “composed of sensors designed to transmit information via a mobile application or a web service” [BEY 17]. More focused on data than on knowledge, applications intended for self-quantification aim to collect, measure and compare various variables in order to improve well-being, and maintain or improve health status [CAM 16]. The incursion of new players in this very lucrative market – only 32% are from health sectors such as medical industries, insurance, hospitals and physicians according to [STA 18] – reveals different concerns and interests. Adrian Staii identifies the economic models that regulate this market, as well as the actors who continue to invest [STA 18, pp. 217–218]: 28% are pure players who develop activities in the field of mobile health; 23% are actors outside the health sector (IT and digital industries) and 11% are non-market organizations (associations, NGOs, etc.). Thus, connected health may prove to be one of the most blatant indicators of the loss of autonomy of traditional health players in a market now dominated by digital players, who are legitimate in prescribing standards in the well-being market [*ibid*, p. 220].

The book is organized in eight chapters. The first two chapters focus on the field of health information and its evolution in the context of Open Access, and aim to characterize health information from the point of view of its uses and associated practices.

Focusing on scientific information, Chérifa Boukacem-Zeghmouri and Hans Dillaerts report on the regulations induced by Open Access, which has developed significantly in recent years in all scientific fields. However, its adhesion

and legitimization are particularly significant in the health field. Plan S, which encourages the publication of research results from public grants in journals or platforms that respect the founding principles of open science, has strongly changed the model of scientific communication in the health field, since scientific research in this field is essentially based on calls for proposals. Moreover, the introduction of new publication models and new actors (Gold publishers, megajournal publishers, preprint servers or predatory publishers), the positioning of historical actors who produce medical information within STM publishing, new practices in terms of publication, dissemination strategies, valorization and mediatization of knowledge all take new criteria into account, such as the general public or reputation on social networks. The researchers situate their reflections in the current context (2020-2021), that of the Covid-19 pandemic, and show that the health crisis highlights the importance and complexity of the issues of publication and dissemination of validated scientific information. Finally, they raise the question of the future of scientific journals, which are not equipped and organized to disseminate research results in real time, to the benefit of preprint platforms, which receive researchers' publications as they progress.

Between opportunities and risks, this first chapter provides elements for understanding the changes underway for all of the actors in scientific and technical information (STI) within the health field.

[Chapter 2](#), written by Céline Paganelli and Viviane Clavier, offers a methodological contribution aimed at characterizing health information by studying the information practices of health professionals and the organization of knowledge. Thus, returning to the documentary perspective, which approaches treatments according to their uses, health information is presented as

strongly linked to contexts of use and practices. Based on the results of field studies and corpus analyses conducted in the field of health for more than 10 years, the researchers propose to rediscuss the contours of health information and put forward elements that allow it to be characterized.

The following chapters aim to understand how actors, whether professionals or citizens, inform themselves, how questions of evaluation of the information collected arise in a sector where the reliability of information is crucial and how health literacy can be considered in digital environments or in relation to specific populations.

In [Chapter 3](#), Eloria Vigouroux-Zugasti, Olivier Le Deuff and Amar Lakel propose a reflection on health literacy in digital information environments. A concept that appeared in the early 1970s, in parallel with that of information literacy, health literacy goes far beyond the framework of informational or media skills and is becoming, particularly with the evolution of health information provision, a public health issue and challenge. In this chapter, the authors question digital health literacy based on the results of field studies: an automatic analysis of web corpora containing health information, as well as a longitudinal qualitative survey on online health practices among a retired population, using digital technologies. The results highlight several trends: the dominant place of the press and health professionals in the health information available on the Internet and the very minor voice of patients. They also show the need for users to develop skills that will enable them to be more comfortable when searching for health-related information.

Digital health literacy covers a variety of skills (informational, digital, media-related, health-related, etc.) that are difficult to evaluate because they require regular

updating. The acquisition of these skills is a matter of training, as well as of mediation mechanisms, the reinforcement of which, by relying on health professionals and mediation actors, seems to be a necessity. However, beyond the aspects relating to training and mediation, the chapter clearly shows that public health policies must take up the issue of digital health literacy insofar as it constitutes a major challenge for therapeutic education.

[Chapter 4](#) is written by two Finnish researchers from the discipline of Library and Information Science: Kristina Eriksson-Backa and Stefan Ek. These researchers are interested in the health information behavior of older people – their interests, the sources they use, the reliability criteria given to information sources, etc. – and propose methods to assess their level of health information literacy and medical knowledge. The notion of information behavior is borrowed from Tom Wilson⁴ and the empirical results were obtained through a survey sent by mail to 1,000 Finns aged 65–79 years. A total of 281 responses were completed and returned by a majority of women (57%), almost half of whom were aged 65–69 years and had an intermediate level of education (44%).

Health information literacy refers to skills related to information literacy, the ability to recognize a need for health information, evaluate and use this information in daily life to make good health decisions, use information ethically and legally and so on. Most studies relate literacy levels to the age of individuals and their ability to read and understand health-related materials. There are many questionnaires designed to measure health literacy. Recent studies have shown an association between low health literacy, poorer health status and increased use of hospital care. Conversely, better health literacy could be an important factor in the adherence to prescribed treatments. One of the contributions of the authors’

research is to highlight a link between the mastery of health information and the perception of patients when communicating with health professionals.

The next two chapters address issues of prevention in health information and communication.

Thus, [Chapter 5](#), written by Cécile Lorient, proposes to study information on HIV/AIDS prevention from the perspective of the categorization of audiences and the hierarchization of actors in the journalistic narrative. Since the end of the 2000s, new biomedical prevention tools have been proposed, including Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP), which is used for HIV prevention by HIV-negative people and is mainly recommended for men who have sex with men (MSM). The publicization of PrEP has sparked controversy around homosexuality, HIV and risk because it calls into question years of prevention based on condom use as the only known and effective tool. In this context, the researcher studies the construction of the journalistic narrative on biomedical prevention. She examines, on the one hand, the use of epidemiological categories to designate people at risk and, on the other hand, the hierarchical structure of the journalists' account of prevention, in order to understand how this contributes to the total or partial exclusion of certain actors, actions, events or problems. The results show that information on biomedical HIV/AIDS prevention is constructed mainly from the point of view of scientific experts and mobilizes mostly stigmatizing epidemiological categories.

Through this analysis, the researcher contributes to the characterization of media information on prevention. Journalistic discourse on prevention gives a predominant place to scientific expertise. Indeed, the views on the biomedical prevention strategies of doctors and researchers specializing in HIV/AIDS are predominant,

while the views of associations and users of these means of prevention are hardly heard. This reliance on experts can be explained in part by the fact that some journalists are not very close to the field of HIV/AIDS, which leads them to give preference to information from the communication services of medical or health institutions which have institutional legitimacy.

[Chapter 6](#), written by Aude Chauviat, also addresses prevention information, as disseminated in prevention campaigns. She situates her argument in a particular historical context, that of the National Prohibition campaign in the United States (1919-1933). Based on content analysis of a corpus of more than 200 pamphlets published by the Anti-Saloon League, as well as a sub-corpus of 82 pamphlets mobilizing health information and created for the most part by the Scientific Federation for Temperance, she shows how health information was mobilized in the prevention campaign against alcohol to the detriment of a moralistic approach to the issue. She postulates that this shift to a preventive discourse based on health information is similar to a form of medicalization of alcohol-related problems and marks an evolution towards a *medical* approach to health, made possible by the acquisition of legitimacy of scientific discourse among the general public.

This contribution proposes a contextualized approach to health information. While anti-alcohol prevention campaigns rely more on specialized information, it is because for one, the discipline and international scientific community specializing in the question of alcohol is becoming institutionalized and more structured, and in parallel, popularized scientific discourses aimed at the American population are emerging.

Finally, the last two chapters address health information from the perspective of knowledge organization and representation.

[Chapter 7](#) presents the testimony of Dr. Four, a private practitioner specializing in ophthalmology, on the role played by professional journals in updating medical knowledge for the practice of his profession. This testimony is very instructive for research on the information practices of health professionals and on the organization of knowledge. Indeed, Dr. Four has been regularly monitoring professional journals for many years (24 years). This activity is integrated in his weekly schedule, since he devotes 15 hours of his time to reading journal articles and processing the bibliography. To practice general ophthalmology, it appears that updating knowledge is essential in many areas of ophthalmology, some of which evolve more rapidly than others. This interview is an opportunity to indicate the fields in which information is more scarce or, on the contrary, those in which it is abundant but, paradoxically, little summarized. These different cases require greater efforts in terms of information research, whether to find rare sources, summarize numerous publications or validate sources. Thus, information practices are fully integrated into medical practice and the information obtained constitutes a strong point in support of the diagnosis, assessment, treatment protocol, referral of patients to other specialists or justification of therapeutic decisions from a medical-legal point of view. This knowledge, built up and developed over time, is recorded in a document base, the organization and structuring of which are designed *by* and *for* Dr. Four's medical practice, and is presented in detail in the chapter.

[Chapter 8](#) by Marcin Trzmielewski and Claudio Gnoli is a joint contribution on the evolution of medical knowledge organization systems (MKOS) from the 1960s to 2019.

These researchers are both specialists in knowledge organization, a field of activity and research that focuses on the design, study and critique of methods for organizing and representing knowledge, most often implemented in libraries and documentation centers. Based on a review of 71 articles published in information and documentation sciences, this chapter describes the main families of MKOSs, the most represented being ontologies, thesauri and classifications. The increase in the number of publications on this subject since 1960 reflects both the vitality of the field of knowledge organization, particularly in the United States and Canada, and the strong dynamics of scientific production in medicine, and the generalization of health information on the medical Internet. Beyond the study of the structuring of concepts, the relationships between concepts, and the evolution of the various fields of medicine, this chapter presents a complete analysis of the “general public” or specialized users of MKOS. The study also focuses on the document processing process and questions the testing of specialized classifications organized by discipline in the face of interdisciplinarity. It appears that this field is still dominated by concerns related to the representation of knowledge, for which classifications also raise socio-cultural or political questions.

References

- [AÏA 98] AÏACH P., DELANOË D. (eds), *L'ère de la médicalisation. Ecce homo sanitas*, Anthropos, Paris, 1998.
- [AKR 12] AKRICH M., RABEHARISOA V., “L'expertise profane dans les associations de patients, un outil de démocratie sanitaire”, *Santé Publique*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 69–74, 2012.

- [ARV 16] ARVEILLER J., TIZON, P., "Avant-propos : démocratie sanitaire, qu'est-ce à dire ?", *Pratiques en santé mentale*, vol. 2, no. 2, p. 2, 2016.
- [BAT 08] BATIFOULIER P., DOMIN, J., GADREAU M., "Mutation du patient et construction d'un marché de la santé. L'expérience française", *Revue française de socio-économie*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 27-46, 2008.
- [BEY 17] BEYALA L., *Connected Objects in Health: Risks, Uses and Perspectives*, ISTE Press, London and Elsevier Ltd, Oxford, 2017.
- [CAB 17] CABOT C., Recherche d'information clinomique dans le Dossier Patient Informatisé : modélisation, implantation et évaluation, Computer Science PhD thesis, Normandy University, 2017.
- [CAM 16] CAMBON, L., "Objets connectés, mobiles, communicants en prévention : dépasser l'outil, penser l'intervention...", *Santé Publique*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 5-6, 2016.
- [CAR 99] CARDON D., HEURTIN J.-P., "Présentation", *Réseaux*, vol. 17, no. 95, pp. 9-12, 1999.
- [CAS 16] CASSAN M., Rapport d'étude : usages et attentes des Français à l'égard du digital en matière d'information sur leur santé, Report, Ipsos MSD, May 2016.
- [CHA 94] CHAMPAGNE P., MARCHETTI D., "L'information médicale. sous contrainte", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales, L'emprise du journalisme*, vols 101-102, 1994.
- [CRA 82] CRAWFORD R., "Healthism and the medicalization of everyday life", *International Journal of Health Services*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 365-388, 1982.
- [DEM 14] DEMAILLY L., "Variations de la 'démocratie sanitaire' et politique publique de santé mentale en

France”, *Sociologies*, 2014.

[DOD 99] DODIER N., “L’espace public de la recherche médicale, autour de l’affaire de la ciclosporine”, *Réseaux, Sciences, malades et espace public*, vol. 17, no. 95, pp. 107-154, 1999.

[FAS 98] FASSIN D., “Avant-propos : les politiques d’une médicalisation”, in AÏACH P., DELANOË D. (eds), *L’ère de la médicalisation. Ecce homo sanitas*, Éditions Economica, Paris, 1998.

[GRE 19] GRENIER C., BERTRAND P., HERVE H., “Quels renouvellements conceptuels pour soutenir l’innovation dans le champ de la santé ? Un regard par les arrangements organisés, les politiques publiques et les capacités entrepreneuriales”, *Innovations*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 5-14, 2019.

[GRI 20] GRIMALDI A., “Patient expert ou patient ressource ?”, *Médecine des maladies métaboliques*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 545-548, 2020.

[LAF 20] LAFON B., “‘Our health in danger’: The extension of sanitization through media coverage of health alerts”, in PAILLIART I. (ed.), *New Territories in Health*, ISTE Ltd, London and John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2020.

[LEF 18] LEFEUVRE K., OLLIVIER R., *La démocratie en santé en question(s)*, Presses de l’EHESP, Rennes, 2018.

[LET 09] LETOURMY A., NAÏDITCH M., “L’émergence de la démocratie sanitaire en France”, *Santé, Société et Solidarité*, no. 2, pp. 5-22, 2009.

[MAR 17] MARGAT A., GAGNAYRE R., LOMBRIL P. *et al.*, “Interventions en littératie en santé et éducation thérapeutique : une revue de la littérature”, *Santé Publique*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 811-820, 2017.

[MOR 18] MORQUIN D., OLOGEANU-TADDEI R., “The Electronic Medical Record: Standardization issues and personalization of information for health professionals”, in PAGANELLI C. (ed.), *Confidence and Legitimacy in Health Information and Communication*, ISTE Ltd, London and John Wiley & Sons, New York 2018.

[PAG 11] PAGANELLI C., CLAVIER V., “Le forum de discussion : une ressource informationnelle hybride entre information grand public et information spécialisée”, in YASRI-LABRIQUE E. (ed.), *Les forums de discussion : agoras du XXI^e siècle ? Théories, enjeux et pratiques discursives*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 2011.

[POL 15] POLIQUIN H., “Analyse critique et dimensionnelle du concept de santéisation”, *Aporia*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 17–29, 2015.

[POU 09] POULAIN J.-P., *Sociologie de l'obésité*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 2009.

[STA 18] STALL A., “Connected health: Between common aspirations and specific interests”, in PAGANELLI C. (ed.), *Confidence and Legitimacy in Health Information and Communication*, ISTE Ltd, London and John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2018.

[TET 20] TETE C., “Les documentalistes comme partenaire dans la prise en charge des patients en fin de vie”, *Médecine Palliative*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 3–6, 2020.

[VIG 18] VIGNERON B., “Chapitre 6. Le management opérationnel des systèmes d'information”, in LOUAZEL M. (ed.), *Le management en santé : gestion et conduite des organisations de santé*, Presses de l'EHESP, Rennes, 2018.

[WAL 98] WALTER J., *Le Téléthon : Scène - Intérêts - Éthique*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 1998.

Introduction written by Viviane CLAVIER and Céline PAGANELLI.

- ¹ See:
<https://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/9gchp/health-literacy/en/>.
- ² Pôle interministériel de prospective et d'anticipation des mutations économiques, Prospective. E-santé : faire émerger l'offre française en répondant aux besoins présents et futurs des acteurs de santé, Synthesis, Edition Marine Automne, Nicole Merle-Lamoot, 2016.
Available at:
https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/prospective/Numerique/2016-02-Pipame-e-sante-synthese.pdf.
- ³ Picard R., Serveille H., Vial A., Technologies et connaissances en santé, Public report, December 2013.
Available at: <https://www.vie-publique.fr/sites/default/files/rapport/pdf/273726.pdf>.
- ⁴ "The totality of human behavior in relation to sources and channels of information, including both active and passive information seeking, and information use (Wilson 2000, p. 49)".

1

Open Access as a Regulation of Scientific Information in Health

1.1. Introduction

At the time of writing (April 2020), a pandemic was spreading across the world, claiming the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. Medical research is at the front line in finding a suitable vaccine against Covid-19. More broadly, however, all research in the field of health contributes to possible responses to the disease, and to its wider management (development of Covid-19 tests by virologists, large-scale implementation of tests by veterinary researchers, etc.). A recent preprint [COL 20] has shown – through a scientometric approach – the breadth of the health fields mobilized around Covid-19 research [BRA 20]. Scientific journals and preprint servers have seen the number of submitted articles soar [HOR 20].

The pandemic has led to a policy dynamic, driven by funding agencies, that requires all publishers to make all articles dealing with Covid-19 research immediately available. The Wellcome Trust¹ was the first, followed by the call for data from the US White House². The International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC) also called upon organizations, scientific communities and publishers to ensure immediate Open Access to scientific publications and research data³.

The biomedical fields are well and truly present, but they are poorly represented in the acronym STM, which conveys a definition that is more representative of the economic and

Index

D, G, H

digital health literacy, [42](#), [48](#)–50, [59](#)–63

Gold

model, [5](#)–7, [9](#)

Road, [3](#)

Green Road, [3](#), [11](#)

health

information, [42](#), [43](#), [46](#), [48](#), [50](#), [53](#), [57](#), [58](#), [61](#)–63, [117](#)–122, [124](#)–126, [128](#)–138, [140](#)–147, [149](#), [172](#), [179](#), [187](#), [190](#)

literacy, [43](#), [72](#), [75](#)–81, [84](#)–86, [89](#)

literacy, [41](#), [48](#), [57](#)–59, [63](#), [64](#)

mediators, [50](#)

I, J

information

behavior, [23](#), [72](#), [73](#), [79](#), [86](#), [179](#)

evaluating, [29](#), [156](#)

practices, [22](#)–26, [28](#), [33](#), [34](#), [41](#), [43](#), [54](#), [163](#), [191](#)

retrieval, [48](#), [54](#), [56](#), [66](#), [130](#), [156](#), [162](#), [175](#), [179](#), [183](#)–186, [188](#)

sources of, [119](#), [154](#), [155](#), [158](#)

journalistic narrative, [98](#)–100, [104](#)–106, [108](#)–113

K, M, O

knowledge

organization of, [21](#)–23, [28](#), [34](#), [131](#), [161](#)–163, [167](#)–170, [172](#), [177](#), [182](#), [184](#), [186](#)–188, [190](#), [191](#), [193](#)

organization systems, [167](#)–169, [172](#)

My Web Intelligence, [42](#), [45](#), [46](#)

Open

Access, [1](#)–14, [26](#)

archives, [3](#), [8](#), [10](#), [11](#), [13](#)

Science, [9](#)

P, S

patients, [20](#)–25, [28](#)–30, [33](#)–35, [41](#), [44](#), [45](#), [50](#), [52](#)–54, [58](#)–61, [63](#), [64](#), [71](#), [75](#), [81](#)–83, [86](#), [152](#)–158, [161](#)–165, [172](#), [174](#), [175](#), [180](#), [183](#), [185](#), [187](#)

prevention, [49](#), [51](#), [97](#)–114, [117](#)–121, [124](#)–131, [141](#), [144](#)–147, [149](#), [150](#), [157](#)

public health, [3](#), [42](#), [43](#), [48](#), [63](#), [64](#), [99](#), [100](#), [105](#), [106](#), [148](#), [150](#), [171](#)–173, [178](#)

publishers, [1](#), [2](#), [6](#), [8](#), [12](#)

scientific

information, [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [13](#), [35](#)

journals, [1](#), [2](#), [108](#)

social media, [19](#), [21](#), [23](#), [24](#), [28](#)–36, [39](#), [68](#), [164](#), [172](#), [175](#), [178](#), [179](#)

structural network analysis, [47](#), [48](#)

Other titles from



in

Health Engineering and Society

2021

BÉRANGER Jérôme

Societal Responsibility of Artificial Intelligence: Towards an Ethical and Eco-responsible AI
(Technological Prospects and Social Applications Set - Volume 4)

CORDELIER Benoit, GALIBERT Olivier

Digital Health Communications
(Technological Prospects and Social Applications Set - Volume 5)

NADOT Michel

Discipline of Nursing: Three-time Knowledge

2020

BARBET Jacques, FOUCQUIER Adrien, THOMAS Yves

Therapeutic Progress in Oncology: Towards a Revolution in Cancer Therapy?
(Health and Patients Set - Volume 2)

MORILLON Laurent, CLAVIER Viviane

Health Research Practices in a Digital Context
(Health Information Set - Volume 4)

PAILLIART Isabelle

New Territories in Health
(Health Information Set - Volume 3)

2019

CLAVIER Viviane, DE OLIVEIRA Jean-Philippe
Food and Health: Actor Strategies in Information and Communication
(Health Information Set - Volume 2)

PIZON Frank
Health Education and Prevention
(Health and Patients Set - Volume 1)

2018

HUARD Pierre
The Management of Chronic Diseases: Organizational Innovation and Efficiency

PAGANELLI Céline
Confidence and Legitimacy in Health Information and Communication
(Health Information Set - Volume 1)

2017

PICARD Robert
Co-design in Living Labs for Healthcare and Independent Living: Concepts, Methods and Tools

2015

BÉRANGER Jérôme
Medical Information Systems Ethics